

**From:** Tom McCormick  
**To:** [Davis, Kris](#)  
**Subject:** another exhibit -- McCormick, Tom BSRE Comments 2012 SEIS Addendum  
**Date:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 4:38:44 PM  
**Attachments:** [McCormick, Tom BSRE Comments 2012 SEIS Addendum.pdf](#)

---

Kris, could you please enter the attached document as an exhibit. I will look for the exhibit number on the County's exhibits web page.

Exhibit name ... McCormick, Tom BSRE Comments 2012 SEIS Addendum

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

*"A small development at Point Wells  
with a second public access road,  
or no development at all."*

*Law Offices*

KARR • TUTTLE • CAMPBELL

*Founded 1904*

*A Professional Service Corporation*

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2900, Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone (206) 223-1313, Facsimile (206) 682-7100

Douglas A. Luetjen  
206-224-8061  
dluetjen@karrtuttle.com

May 18, 2012

Via Email

Mr. David Killingstad  
Snohomish County  
Planning & Development Services  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S #604  
Everett, WA 98201

RE: Point Wells Draft EIS Addendum, BSRE Point Wells Comments

Dear Dave:

Submitted on behalf of BSRE Point Wells, LP, we have attached comments and suggested changes to the May 4, 2012 Draft SEPA Addendum for the Final SEIS Docket XIII Amendments to Snohomish County's Comprehensive Plan.

Please note, both Gary Huff and I will be out of the office the week of May 21. During that week I can be reached by both email and on my cell phone at 206-399-1050.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Douglas A. Luetjen

DAL:sar

Enclosure

cc: Steven D. Farkas  
D. Mark Wells  
Steven Ohlenkamp  
Gary Huff

**BSRE POINT WELLS, LP  
REVIEW COMMENTS REGARDING  
MAY 4, 2012 DRAFT SEPA ADDENDUM FOR FINAL SEIS  
Docket XIII AMENDMENTS TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Cover Page:** The reference to “Paramount of Washington LLC” should probably be updated to read “BSRE Point Wells, LP” or to read simply “Point Wells.”

**Acronyms:** “BSRE” is the abbreviation for “BSRE Point Wells, LP” and not “Blue Square Real Estate.” “GMHB decision” should be added as the abbreviation/acronym for the GMHB Corrected Final Decision and Order dated May 17, 2011.

**Page 1, Lines 6-7:** This first sentence in this paragraph should be revised to read: “In April 2011, the GMHB issued a Final Decision and Order for Coordinated Case 9-3-0013c and 10-3-011c (Shoreline III and Shoreline IV); however, this order was superseded by the GMHB’s Corrected Final Decision and Order dated May 17, 2011.

[Please note, any quotations from the GMHB decision included in the Addendum should be reviewed to confirm that the quotation is consistent with the GMHB’s Corrected Final Decision and Order.]

**Page 1, line 23:** As a point of clarification, it is not the intent of BSRE that the usage of vanpools be part of a permanent transportation solution. We differentiate between vanpools and the potential for permanent, contracted bus service to transport residents (and others who might be picked up along Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road) between Point Wells (with its future Sound Transit station) and the Shoreline Park & Ride lot at 192<sup>nd</sup> and Aurora Avenue North.

**Page 1, line 24:** BSRE would like to discuss further the possibility of reinserting the original language which established a 0.25 mile requirement. Further planning efforts following the adoption of the revised 0.5 mile requirement suggested that the change to the 0.5 mile requirement may be unnecessary.

**Page 2, lines 10-12:** The last sentence of this paragraph should read: “The site was transferred to BSRE Point Wells, LP in 2010. Currently, Paramount Petroleum Corporation uses the site as both a marine fuels transfer facility and an asphalt distribution facility.”

**Page 5, lines 28-31:** The last sentence of this paragraph should read: “A judge ruled on November 23, 2011 that Snohomish County could not process BSRE’s application for an Urban Center until the County had taken action to comply with SEPA as set forth in the GMHB’s decision.

**Page 6 and 7:** As a general comment, it should be noted that the GMHB’s decision is in large part based on the inclusion in the County’s Comprehensive Plan of language which the GMHB

interpreted as incorporating the definition of “urban centers” as contained in Vision 2040. The GMHB indicated that such an adoption was not required—that the County vision need not be identical to that in Vision 2040. Thus, we believe that direct linkage and incorporation of Vision 2040 should be expressly separated from the present compliance effort.

**Page 9, lines 17-22:** We suggest the deletion of the reference to Shoreline’s 4,000 daily trip limit. At the time of adoption of the challenged ordinances, Shoreline’s only reference to its trip limit was the suggestion of 8,250 daily trips contained in its traffic study. This latter number is the number the GMHB referenced in its decision. The 4,000 figure was adopted after the submittal of a short plat application submitted by BSRE and the adoption of this lesser limit remains on appeal. It should be noted that when Woodway amended its Comprehensive Plan, it did so with the express intent to be consistent with Shoreline. Woodway adopted the 8,250 figure.

**Page 9, lines 23-24:** The first sentence of this paragraph should be amended to read, in part, “. . . because Shoreline considered the background traffic estimates . . . to be too high . . .”

**Page 15, line 27 and page 16, lines 23-24:** While we agree that the potential for liquefaction and engineering solutions will be necessary at the project stage, we see no reason why this document should include references to this issue. It is not a necessary part of the compliance effort.

**Page 24, line 32:** The Urban Center application was filed by BSRE prior to the effective date of the revisions to the County’s shoreline master program and thus compliance with these revisions are not required. Thus, we suggest the removal of the statement that the project must comply with the new regulations or, as an alternative, that such compliance requirement be acknowledged as uncertain.

**Page 35, lines 22-23:** The statement that the future development may interfere with views from residences at the top of the bluff in Woodway is misleading. Our view analysis shows that the development will not be visible to homes above the site on the bluff. Portions of the dock and low-rise buildings along the water may be visible in lateral views from homes located at a distance to the north of the development. These lateral view impacts, if they occur at all, do not involve structures for which additional height may be requested under this code provision.

**Page 46, line 27:** The document states average trip generation rates were used. However, the tables on page 47 use formula rates that result in slightly different results than average rates. We recommend that this statement be clarified.

**Page 47, Table 4.11-4:** Footnotes b and c for this table state that specific reductions were taken for internal trips, walk/bike, and pass-by. We believe that pass-by trips are inapplicable and should be considered more of an internal capture matter.

**Page 48, line 4:** A 10% reduction is applied to all uses without documentation. For example, when added to 34% pass-by for retail, it becomes a 44% reduction in trips. Therefore, further explanation and documentation should be provided.

**Page 48, lines 10- 16:** The use of the 60% north and 40% south traffic distribution percentages differ from the DEA 75% south and 25% north traffic distribution numbers. We recommend that this difference be explained and then the most appropriate distribution percentages be used.

**Page 51, line 5:** Please revise the language to read: “Gross Cumulative Trip Generation Prior to Appropriate Adjustments.”

**Page 51, line 11:** The table should read “Cumulative Gross Trip Generation.”

**Page 51, line 13:** The heading should be labeled “Trip Generation.”

**Page 52, lines 24-34:** The included language appears to be from DEA’s TIA. This inclusion might be seen it as inconsistent with the methodology used in 2009 on Page 48. The addendum should clearly state that DEA’s methodology was appropriate.

**Page 53, lines 16-22:** This information appears to be taken from DEA’s traffic distribution to the north. The addendum should clearly state that this methodology was appropriate if it is incorporated. There needs to be more general discussion about each method. It appears that the 2009 SEIS is characterized as “conservative” and the TIA as more “precise.” If so, then it should be clearly stated that DEA’s methodology for trip generation and internal capture was appropriate.

**Page 55, lines 2-6:** In this section the residents are described as over 55, but then senior housing trip generation rates are used. We suggest the addition of a statement to the effect that this outcome is likely even without an official designation of such units as “senior housing.”

**Page 56, Table 4.11-10:** This table shows trip reductions for senior residents. At present we prefer to avoid the need to designate such units as senior units.

**Page 57, line 9:** The 44% internal capture should be well documented. The 20% internal capture for the reduced commercial should also be well documented.

**Page 57, lines 13-17:** The source of the “current” 8,250 Shoreline trip threshold should be explained. This is a policy limit established by Shoreline and does not indicate the capacity of the road. The 825 limit is also the result of unmitigated impacts at one location. Further explanation should be provided.

**Page 58, lines 1-10:** Please see comment to Page 1, line 24.

**Page 58, line 23:** We believe the appropriate reference is to Richmond Beach Drive. All references to Richmond Beach Road and to Richmond Beach Drive should be double-checked.

**Page 61, lines 15 and 17:** The assumption of no additional transit mode share adjustment is consistent with DEA's approach. However, DEA did receive comments from Snohomish County that an urban center by default has higher mode split to transit. Maybe a range of additional trip generation reductions that could be reasonably expected with transit should be identified.

**Page 62, lines 1-11:** We believe it more accurate to state that the Sound Transit station was (and remains) included in their long range plan. However, funding for that station was not included as part of the ST2 plan. Sound Transit would be expected to be interested in providing service if the cost of the station is provided by BSRE. (And we believe that station can be provided at a cost of much less than \$60 million.) The current language of the addendum does not clearly reflect the applicant's willingness to fund a station. In addition, it should be noted that there is precedent for Sound Transit to add developer funded stations that don't meet spacing requirements. For example, Wright Runstad did so on East Link and was able to have the 120<sup>th</sup> Station added to the plan.

**Page 62, line 3:** The commuter rail station proposed by BSRE should not be described as including a parking lot, as any lot of material size would generate traffic. There will be adequate transit service to get to and from the station.

**Page 63, Table 4.11-13:** We question the appropriateness of the inclusion of the cost of such mitigation. A listing of potential mitigation requirements would be more appropriate.

**Page 64, lines 1-5:** Please clarify the source of this statement.

**Page 65, lines 20-21:** We recommend deletion of the last sentence in this paragraph regarding an extension of Point Wells along this corridor. There are at present no plans for such an extension.

**Page 65, line 22:** Delete the last sentence as this is an issue more appropriately addressed in a project specific EIS.

**Page 66, lines 3-5:** Please add the following to the list: "or other configurations preferred by or developed with the community."

**Page 66, line 27 through page 67, lines 1-6:** We would prefer that the term "road diet" not be used. This concept is not well understood and unnecessarily causes negative reactions. We suggest renaming this section to "Potential Conversion of NW 196<sup>th</sup> Street/NW Richmond Beach Road from Four to Three Travel Lanes."

**Page 68, line 29:** We do not believe that Shoreline's Subarea Plan 2 had been adopted at the time of publication of the original SEPA documents and therefore the inclusion of this information is questioned.

**Page 71, lines 3-33:** The Point Wells UC application submitted by BSRE includes confirmation of future availability of the necessary utilities.

**Page 72, lines 19-23:** The following should be added: “Snohomish County Fire District No. 1 has also indicated its interest in providing fire and EMT services to a future development. In addition, the UC Application submitted by BSRE includes the location of a fire station on the site (that could be used by police services as their “storefront” location).

**Page 72, line 29:** Reference should be made to the provision of substantial on-site park and recreation opportunities, as recognized by the GMHB in its Corrected Final Decision and Order.

**Page 74, lines 1-4:** We question the accuracy of this statement and therefore request the inclusion of further documentation.

**Page 74, lines 23-36:** Please include a reference to the inclusion of on-site police and fire facilities and services as part of the project application.

**Page 76, lines 31-32:** The new zoning designation is “Urban Center.” Planned Community Business was an interim zoning designation.

**Page 79, lines 12-16:** We question whether a reader will accept two different trip distributions without more a more complete explanation. This language appears to be saying both distributions are acceptable. The inclusion of further clarification, or the use of the trip distribution with greater south-bound trips, would be our preferences.

**Page 79, lines 30-32:** We recommend including further documentation regarding the 44% and 20% capture rates.

**Page 80, lines 13-16:** The second sentence of this paragraph should be revised to read: “The provision of extended bus transit service or the use of vanpool service along Richmond Beach Drive NW could also increase commuter rail ridership by providing access to the existing Sound Transit station via bus or van. In addition, the construction of a Sound Transit station at Point Wells, as proposed by BSRE, would provide additional commuter transit service at the transit center of the proposed development.”

**Page 80, lines 17-20:** As stated earlier, it is possible that the change to 0.5 mile walking distance is unnecessary.

**General Comment:** The Addendum should disclose when it is directly incorporating DEA’s work and when the Addendum is commenting relative to the validity or application of DEA’s work. There are a lot of differences between the analysis and methodology between the two. Including both without a clear explanation as to why it is acceptable to do so is not advisable.